seem to think that I am getting an additional time of 6 months for this purpose, But what I respectfully submit to the House is that there is no question of fresh Companies being started with this 'Sword of Domocles' hanging over their heads. If in this one year these people will be able to exploit more people, I can only say that this legislation is hardly based upon solid grounds. If as a matter of fact people find that there is an attempt at legislation checking the exploitation, is it reasonable to suppose that others would be bold enough to come out with a proposal to start a Company and it is still more foolish to join in that company. If there is an assurance that no fresh Companies will be started in the meanwhile, the Hon'ble Member has, it seems to me no objection to the extension of the period. How can one give the assurance when we are dealing with about 12 lakhs of people and mischief-mongers will be found in every community? At lesat to nullify the promise I made, somebody may come forward with a proposal to start a Company. Under any circumstances I am not going to give the assurance. But the only assurance that I can give is the solid common sense of our Cochin people.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. K. T. Mathew.—Sir, I move that the Cochin Provident Insurance Societies Bill, as amended by the Council, be taken up and passed.

Mr. K. M. Ibrahim.—Sir, I second it.

Motion put and carried.

Amendment to Standing Order No. 31 (1).

Mr. K. T. Mathew.—Sir, I move that the following amendment be taken into consideration:—"Add the following to Standing Order No. 31 (1):—'But any Member may object to its introduction, if a copy of the bill has not been available for the use of Members for seven days and such objection shall prevail unless the President in the exercise of his power to suspend the Standing Order allows its introduction". I think no speech is required since the matter was explained in the last meeting of the Council.

Mr. K. G. Nayar.—Sir, I second it.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Sir, I beg to move the following amendment to Mr. K. T. Mathew's amendment:—

"After the words 'object to its itroduction' and before the words 'if a copy of the Bill' in Mr. Mathew's amendment, introduce the following words:—

"If, in the case of a bill that has been published in the Gazette, a period of one week has not elapsed between such publication and the date of introduction and, in the case of bills for introducing for which leave has been granted by the Council."

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

In the case of bills published in the Gazette under Rule 29, leave to introduce may not be necessary, whereas in the case of the other bills leave to introduce is necessary. My amendment seeks to make a distinction between these two sets of bills. In the case of bills published in the Gazette, I want to specify or rather define the period of time more specifically by saying that the bill should have been published in the Gazette 7 days before it is sought to be introduced. As the law now stands there is nothing to prevent its introduction on the very next day after the bill was published in the Gazette. That give rise to some complaints and Mr. Mathew proposes to find a solution for that difficulty. Now this amendment, while accepting the period of 7 days, only lays down a further condition that if the bill has been published in the Gazette 7 days period to its introduction in the Council the bill may be moved. With regard to the bills which have not been published in the Gazette Mr. Mathew's amendment will stand. I request that the Hon'ble Members will be pleased to accept the amendment.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I second it.

Mr. K. T. Mathew.—Sir, does not what the Hon'ble Law Member says amounts to this, *i. e.*, the publication in the Gazette should be taken as notice being given to the Members of the House? It tantamounts to that.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—You may take it that away. 7 days prior to the introduction of the Bill in the Council should be considered adequate publication. The Gazette is sent to all the Members. If they will take it as notice, I have no objection.

Mr. K. T. Mathew.—Sir, I oppose the amendment. The reason is this, a notification in the Gazette does not tantamount to a notice being given to the Hon'ble Members of the Council. Government has got the right of publishing the bills in the Gazette. Non-official bills the Government do not publish in the Gazette unless leave to introduce has been given by the Council. I had sent some bills to the Government for publication in the Gazette, but the Diwan refused to publish them. The Diwan, as far as my knowledge goes, has never given permission, except once by a mistake to publish a non-official bill in the Gazette before leave to introduce is given. Secondly, what the Government says is that the publication in the Gazette must be taken as notice to the Members of the Council. If that is so the date of the commencement of the meeting is also published in the Gazette and that should also be taken as notice given to the Hon'ble Members of the Council. There is a distinction between publication in the Gazette and notices issued to Council Members. Gazette notification is primarily intended for the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

information of the public and it is not notice sent to Council Members.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Sir, on a point of information, as things stand now does the mere publication in the Gazette tantamounts to a notice?

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—Yes, Copies of the Bill are also sent to the Members.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Sir, the only thing is that all the members must get a chance of going through the Bill. It is immaterial how we come to know of it, provided reasonable facilities are given to the Members. It is a prerogative enjoyed by the Government. I do not think that anybody can say that he has got no noticeif the bill is published in the Gazette. For these reasons I support the amendment.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—Sir, there is the last portion of the amendment which says "Unless the President in the exercise of his power to suspend the Standing Order allows its introduction". Therefore, I do not see any point in the amendment now proposed.

Mr. K. G. Nayar.—Sir, I also rise to oppose the amendment. I wish to add one word more because of my personal experience in getting the agenda regarding the bills introduced in this Council. It has been a matter which I have already brought to the notice of the authorities that very often it so happens that when bills are being introduced here, I get them on the day prior to my starting from Palghat. I generally give instructions to redirect the tapals to Ernakulam, and I get it only that I am attending the Council. The point that I wish to stress here is that as non-officials we are entitled to get notice of all these bills apart from its publication in the Gazette. It is a prerogative enjoyed by us. I do not see any reason to change what we find here in the amendment of the Hon'ble Member for Kunnamkulam. There is the discretion given to the President of this Council to exercise his powers to see whether he could suspend the Standing Order in certain special cases. If that be so, the practical effect of the working of the amendment of the Hon'ble the Law Member would certainly be as it stands. I request the Government to see whether in the light of the amendment of the Hon'ble Member for Kunnamkulam and the wide discretion given to the President, whether there is any real necessity for this amendment. What we emphasise here is the availability of these bills for the use of Members 7 days prior to its introduction. I do not think there is any necessity for moving the amendment.

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Sir, Sanction is not generally given to a non-official Member to publish a bill in the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Gazette before its introduction. Because this might lead to complaints of Government making invidious distinctions. For giving this concession to one particular bill in a previous Council there was a good deal of hubbub. Therefore, unless there is any specific urgent reason for publishing the bill before introduction, such concession cannot be allowed. That is why that concession is not given generally. Government has always been enjoying this concession. They will have very urgent bills to be introduced and that is a concession which every Government has got to enjoy. If there should be a Government you cannot deny them such concessions. The Government as a body should have certain privileges and concessions. They cannot be classified along with the opposition or the non-official side. Therefore, I request the Hon'ble Members not to impose such restrictions upon them.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Sir, the object of proposing this amendment is to give some definiteness to Mr. Mathew's amendment. The language of the amendment proposed by the Hon'ble Member for Kunnamkulam is as it stands rather vague, What he says is that 'any Member may object to its introduction, if a copy of the bill has not been available for the use of Members. The words 'has not been available" may be construed in several ways. One Hon'ble Member may say that he was at such and such a place on one day and at another place on another day and so on. And Government business would suffer in the mean time. On the other hand a copy of the Gazette is forwarded to every Member. Further it is only the introduction stage. The bill will not be passed into law forthwith. There could never be any hardship. The Hon'ble Members will be pleased to realise the spirit in which the amendment is introduced. We must have some specific time limit. Government cannot go on speculating whether a copy of the bill has been received by the Hon'ble Members who may be residing here, there or anywhere. It is with that object that this amendment is introduced and I request that it should not be misunderstood. The President may, no doubt, sanction the introduction of a bill at shorter notice Unless it is absolutely necessary we do not want to use an exceptional prerogative vested in the President as a usual method of procedure. I always thought that this House was jealous in guarding the interests of the Council. These aspects may be borne in mind by the Hon'ble Members when voting one way or the other on this amendment.

Amendment put and carried.

Motion put and carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. T. Mahew.—Sir, I move that the amendment to Standing Order No. 31 (1) as amended be taken up and passed to morrow.

Mr. K. G. Nayar.—Sir, I second it.

Motion put and carried.

Resolutions—5 Bhajanamadham Colony etc., of Depressed Classes.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. പി. വള്ളോൻ.—"ഈ രാജ്യത്തെ അധഃകൃതരുടെ ഉന്നമനാർത്ഥം ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട ഗവൺമെണ്ടിൽ നിന്നും അനുവദിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ജനമഠം, കോളനി, പുതുവൽ പതിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളവയും മറ്റും അതാതു സ്ഥലങ്ങളിലുള്ള അധഃകൃത പൊതുയോഗങ്ങളിലേക്കു വിട്ടുകൊടുക്കുവാൻ ഈ സഭ ഗവൺമെണ്ടിനോടു ശുപാർശചെയ്യുകൊള്ളുന്നു." സംരക്ഷണ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെണ്ടിലെ ഭരണത്തെപ്പറ്റി ഒരന്വേഷണം നടത്താമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞതുകൊണ്ടു് അങ്ങിനെ ഒരന്വേഷണം നടത്തിക്കാണുന്നതുവരെ ആ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെണ്ടിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു് ഒന്നുംതന്നെ പറയുവാൻ ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നില്ല. അതുകൊണ്ടു് ഞാൻ ഈ റസല്യൂഷൻ ഉപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നില്ല.

രാമവർമ്മതമ്പുരാൻ.—ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെണ്ടിനെപ്പറ്റി അന്വേഷണം നടത്താമെന്നു് ആരാണു പറഞ്ഞതു്. അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്യാമെന്നു ആരും പറഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ല. കമ്പ്ലയിന്റ്സു വല്ലതുമുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതു് എന്തെല്ലാമാണെന്നു് ആപ്പീസ്സിലേക്കു് എഴുതി അയച്ചാൽ അതിനെപ്പറ്റി എൻക്വയർ ചെയ്യാമെന്നാണു് പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ളതു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. പി. വള്ളോൻ.—കമ്പ്ലയിന്റ്സു എഴുതി അയച്ചാൽ അതിനെപ്പറ്റി അന്വേഷണം നടത്തുമോ?

രാമവർമ്മതമ്പുരാൻ.—എഴുതി അയച്ചാൽ അതിനെപ്പറ്റി നിശ്ചയമായും അന്വേഷിക്കാം.

The resolution was, therefore, considered withdrawn.

6. Anomalous position of the clerks of the Registration Department.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—The resolution standing in my name runs thus:—

This council recommends to the Government to consider favourably the anomalous position in which the clerks in Registration Department are now placed (Vide Ref. on C. No. 1823/05 Endorsement on C. No. 2608/04, Service Order 211/04 D. P. R. 4 —1540/06, Dis. No. 2778/D/06, D. P. dated 30th March 1931.

Sir, from the beginning of the Department there were three grades of clerks in the Department Head clerk, 2nd clerk and clerks—24 clerks on Rs. 25 each, 25 clerks on Rs. 20, 3 Temporary on 20. Now there are 52 clerks getting 25 to 30. The pay of the clerks both in Magistrate's Court and the Registry Office was the same till the revision. Both in 1087 and 1094 when there was reorganisation the pay of the clerks in both the offices was

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly